



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,849	10/08/2004	Alan Hocknell	PU2252	5848

23454 7590 02/23/2006

CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY  
2180 RUTHERFORD ROAD  
CARLSBAD, CA 92008-7328

EXAMINER
----------

HUNTER, ALVIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/711,849	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HOCKNELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Alvin A. Hunter	<b>Art Unit</b> 3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/31/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobson (USPN 6602149) in view of Nagamoto (USPN 5669827).

Regarding claim 1, Jacobson discloses a club head comprising a face component having a mass ranging from 50 to 110 grams, wherein the face component comprises a striking plate portion and a return portion, and an aft body connected to the face component having a mass of 10 to 60 grams wherein the golf club head has a mass of 165 to 300 grams and a volume of 290 to 600 cc (See Abstract and Column 14, lines 41 through 64). Jacobson discloses the return portion and striking plate portion made of a metal but does not disclose the portions made of a low density material or a second layer disposed on the interior surface of the striking plate portion. Nagamoto discloses a club head wherein a second layer is disposed on the inside surface of the striking plate portion. The second layer is disclosed as being more rigid and higher in mechanical strength than that of the striking plate portion (See Paragraph bridging Columns 2 and 3). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate a second layer to the interior surface of the striking portion as taught by Nagamoto, in order to improve the feel and sound when striking a golf ball.

Regarding claim 2, Jacobson discloses the club head further comprising a weight member having a mass of 30 to 120 grams (See Column 14, lines 41 through 64).

Regarding claims 3, 8, 9, and 10, Jacobson discloses the striking plate portion made of a metal, preferably titanium, but does not limit the striking plate portion to be made of any other material. Nagamoto discloses the shell structure made of titanium, stainless steel, or aluminum (See Paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3). Regardless of the material, Nagamoto notes that the second layer is higher in mechanical strength and rigidity than the striking plate portion. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the exterior surface of the striking plate portion and the second layer having any density so long as the second plate has higher mechanical strength and rigidity so as to improve the feel and sound of the club head. Moreso, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the second layer made of any material so long as the second plate has higher mechanical strength and rigidity so as to improve the feel and sound of the club head.

Regarding claim 4, Jacobson discloses the aft-body composed of a plurality of plies of pre-preg material (See Paragraph bridging columns 8 and 9).

Regarding claim 5, Jacobson discloses the aft-body having a mass of 15 to 50 grams (See Column 14, lines 41 through 64).

Regarding claim 6, Jacobson discloses the weight member having a mass of 50 to 80 grams (See Column 14, lines 41 through 64).

Regarding claim 7, Jacobson discloses the volume being most preferably 360 to 395 cc (See Column 14, lines 32 through 40).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Jacobson in view of Nagamoto does not disclose the exterior surface of the striking face made of magnesium. Applicant does not note magnesium provide any result different from that of aluminum. Nagamoto discloses a striking plate portion made of aluminum. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found the material selection to be obvious, being that aluminum is noted as achieving the same result. Also see the above regarding claims 3 and 8-10 in reference to the second layer.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant does not note why the thickness of the exterior surface of the striking plate portion and the second layer are critical in order to attain the invention. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found the thickness of each layer to naturally flow from Jacobson and Nagamoto so long as the combination provides improved feel and sound.

Regarding claim 14, see the above regarding claims 1, 3, 4, and 8-10.

Regarding claim 15, see the above regarding claim 7.

Regarding claim 16, Jacobson discloses the inertia about the Izz axis being 3750 to 4250 g\*cm<sup>2</sup> (See Column 16m lines 28 through 36).

Regarding claim 17, see the above regarding claim 13.

Regarding claim 18, see the above regarding claims 3 and 8-10.

Regarding claim 19, Jacobson discloses the aft body comprising a crown and sole.

Regarding claim 20, Jacobson discloses the sole portion comprising a bottom section and a ribbon section.

Art Unit: 3711

Regarding claims 21, 23, and 24, Jacobson discloses the return portion having an upper and lower lateral section.

Regarding claim 22, Jacobson discloses the return portion having a toe and heel lateral section.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter at telephone number (571) 272-4411.



Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.



**EUGENE KIM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**